

submitted to obviate this objection. In a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated September 11, 2002, the Examiner required a marked-up copy of the Abstract as submitted in the August 30, 2002, Amendment. A marked-up copy of the Abstract consistent with the amendment to the Abstract made in the Amendment filed August 30, 2002, is shown in the Appendix.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 10, 2002

By:



D. Kent Stier  
Reg. No. 50,640  
(404) 653-6559

FINNEGAN  
HENDERSON  
FARABOW  
GARRETT &  
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
202.408.4000  
Fax 202.408.4400  
[www.finnegan.com](http://www.finnegan.com)